REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 9, 11, 12 and 14-19 remain in the application. Claims 9, 11, 12, and 14-19 are subject to examination. Claims 1 and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-8, 10 and 13 were previously canceled to facilitate prosecution of the instant application.

Under the heading "Claims Rejections - 35 USC § 103" on pages 2-9 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 9, 11, 12 and 14-19 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,898,687 to Harriman et al. (hereinafter Harriman) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,483,843 to Mauger (hereinafter Mauger) and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,135,156 to Sanders Jr., et al. (hereinafter Sanders) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The rejection has been noted and claims 9 and 19 have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. Support for the changes is found on page 3, lines 1-6, and page 7, lines 16-19, of the specification of the instant application.

Neither Harriman, Mauger nor Sanders discloses a method in

which the received complete data packets are temporarily stored at an input of the switching system. Furthermore, none of the cited references discloses that only a message is sent to an output of the switching system so that the transmission of data and the transmission of the information for defining the sequence for transmission of the data are independent of one another, if the data packet is received for transmitting it to another switching system (as recited in the fourth paragraphs of amended claims 9 and 19 of the instant application).

Therefore, none of the cited references describes or hints at the kernel of the invention of the instant application.

Thus, the object of the instant application is to provide a method for operating a switching system for data packets having inputs and outputs, with temporary storage of the complete data packets at the input, and combines the advantages of temporary storage at the input with the advantages of temporary storage at the output. None of the prior art references individually or in combination teaches this feature and the related advantages.

As noted in amended claims 9 and 19 of the instant application, there are the steps of temporarily storing complete data packets at the input of the switching system

and only sending a message so that the transmission of data and the transmission of the information for defining the sequence for transmission of the data are independent of one another. The necessary bandwidths for the internal connections in the switching system is determined exclusively by the bandwidths of the local physical inputs, with a small addition for the logical channel for the messages (see pages 2 and 3 of the specification).

Further advantages of the present invention that can be derived by the subject matter of amended claims 9 and 19 are now further described. The inventive method according to amended claims 9 and 19 separates, for the first time, the transmission of data from the transmission of the appropriated information to the sequence controller, which makes the system open to matching. Advantageously, the necessary bandwidth of the internal data links is determined only by the bandwidth of the local physical connections plus a little surplus for the logical message channels. Therefore, the bandwidth required for the internal connections is fixed and is not dependent on the total throughput of the system. Thus, the outputs of the system are protected against overload or unnecessary idling. In this respect, the inventive message acts in the manner of a throughput controller. Moreover, the inventive method

according to amended claims 9 and 19 combines the advantages of input-buffer systems and output-buffer systems and avoids the disadvantages of the prior art solutions (see page 12 first paragraph, of the specification).

In contrast to amended claims 9 and 19 of the instant application, the cited prior art references, in particular Harriman describes the use of the header from the data packet as a message that is then broken down into its components. By using the header as a message, there arise at least two disadvantages compared to the invention of the instant application. First, the complete data packets cannot be stored at the input of the switching system after receiving them. Therefore, higher bandwidth capabilities are necessary within the switching system. Second, if the header from the data packet is used as a message, the transmission of data and the transmission of the information for defining the sequence for transmission of the data <u>are not independent</u> of one another. Consequently, on the one hand the extraction of the header costs some more time cycles and on the other hand the bandwidth requirements further increase in contrast to the method of the invention of the instant application.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either

show or suggest the features of claims 9 or 19. Claims 9 and 19 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 9.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 9, 11, 12 and 14-19 are solicited.

If an extension of time is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Any extension fee associated therewith should be charged to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

For Applicants

RALPH E. LOCHER
REG. NO. 41,947

REL:cgm

April 25, 2005

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101